

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/397,188	09/16/1999	GORDON GRIGOR	0100.9900670	8413
23418	7590 03/31/2003			
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ			EXAMINER	
	22 N. LASALLE STREET HICAGO, IL 60601		CHAUHAN, ULKA J	
		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	C ₄
			DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003	9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/397,188	GRIGOR ET AL.				
Autiony Aution	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ulka J. Chauhan	2676				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a not places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	•				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·				
10. Other:		2.11				
		Ulka J. Chauhan Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2676				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 3/3/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited prior art fails to teach the limitations recited in claim 1. As argued in the previous office actions, Engstrom discloses rendering a display image to a back buffer ("stored at a first memory location of a first frame buffer") [col. 15 lines 27-43] and when an application completes rendering to back buffer, it flips the front and the back buffer to display from the front buffer after ensuring that the application does not begin wrting to a buffer that the display device is reading [col. 7 lines 25-29 and col. 19 lines 57-61]. Engstrom discloses reading the scan line register to analyze the scan line position ("determining a second memory location representative of a raster location") [col. 21 lines 28-33]. Engstrom discloses that if the position of the scan line is less then the position at the time of the last flip, then it is assumed that the display address has been changed, and the page was flipped, and it is safe to update the display address for the current flip request [col. 21 lines 28-48]. This would indicate a flip of the front and back buffer to proceed so that the application can start writing to the back buffer ("enabling... storage of the image at the first memory location when the second memory location indicates the raster has accessed data at the first memory location"). However, If the current position of the scan line is below the position of the scan line at the last flip, and a refresh amount of time has not elapsed, then an error is returned and the front and back buffer are not flipped ("preventing storage... when the second memory location indicates the raster has not accessed data at the first memory location") [col. 22 lines 19-30 and Fig. 12A].

Applicant also argues that Engstrom requires at least two buffers while the claimed invention is not restricted to two buffers. In response t applicant's argument, it is noted that this feature is not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed Cir. 1993).

Applicant also requests supporting reference to be cited in view of the Official Notice. A reference will be provided to support the Official Notice in response to a filing of a proper reply to the final rejection..